



9th E-Reporting and E-Monitoring Intersessional Working Group Meeting

16 June 2026

Online

10:00am - 2:00pm (Pohnpei time)

WCPFC EM Framework Considerations

ERandEMIWG9-2026-02

4 May 2026

Independent EM Data Review on the *High Seas*: Options for Consideration

Low Independence/HIGH Risk

High Independence/LOW Risk

Flag State record analysis & Regional Standards	Hybrid: Flag State record analysis & independent data quality review	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State & independent data quality review	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State & simultaneous data provision to Flag State and Secretariat	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State, simultaneous data provision to Flag State and Secretariat & independent data quality review	Centralised independent review body
---	--	---	---	---	--	-------------------------------------

	Approach	Description	Relative level of Independence	Key Considerations
1.	Flag State record analysis & Regional Standards	EM record analysis undertaken by Flag State guided by agreed regional standards and procedures	Low	Improved consistency; independence remains limited
2.	Hybrid: Flag State record analysis & independent review for data quality	EM record analysis undertaken by Flag State AND review for data quality undertaken by Secretariat on a sample basis.	Low- Moderate	Enhances oversight; consider review percentage for data quality and Secretariat resourcing needs
3.	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State	EM record analysis undertaken by accredited independent third- party providers on behalf of Flag State	Moderate	Improves impartiality; requires Secretariat accreditation of third-party providers
4.	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State & independent review for data quality	EM record analysis undertaken by accredited independent third- party provider on behalf of Flag State AND review for data quality undertaken by Secretariat on a sample basis.	Moderate-High	Improves impartiality; requires Secretariat accreditation of third-party providers; consider review percentage for data quality and Secretariat resourcing needs
5.	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State & simultaneous data provision to Flag State and Secretariat	EM record analysis undertaken by an accredited third party provider on behalf of the Flag State AND upon completion of analysis, the <i>same EM data</i> must be provided at the same time to the Flag State and the Secretariat	High	Removes information gatekeeping; requires Secretariat accreditation of third-party providers; consider management of annotated data throughout the year
6.	Hybrid: Third party conducts record analysis for Flag State, simultaneous data provision to Flag State and Secretariat & independent review for data quality	EM record analysis undertaken by an accredited third party provider on behalf of the Flag State AND upon completion of analysis, the <i>same EM data</i> must be provided at the same time to the Flag State and the Secretariat AND review for data quality undertaken by Secretariat on a sample basis.	Higher	Removes information gatekeeping; requires Secretariat accreditation of third-party providers; consider management of annotated data throughout the year; consider review percentage for data quality and Secretariat resourcing needs
7.	Centralised independent review body	A single independent entity conducts all EM data review	Highest	Cost and resource requirements; reduced flexibility for Flag States

Key Definitions:

EM Records Analysis/Interpretation- The process of an EM Analyst reviewing EM records and converting them into EM Data.

Review for Data Quality- The verification process of re-analyzing/interpreting a portion of previously analyzed EM records to determine completeness, adherence to protocols, and accuracy of the EM Data produced by the EM Analyst.

<i>Independent review for data quality undertaken by the Secretariat (2)</i>	
Data Quality and Integrity to verify the accuracy, completeness, and consistency of submitted data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automated validation checks, cross-dataset comparisons (e.g., VMS, logbooks), anomaly detection, completeness tracking)
And/or Data Verification which is a direct comparison of annotated data against EM record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent video review sampling, re-analysis of EM data, verification of catch and effort records.
<i>Accredited independent third-party EM review provider (3)</i>	
Establish accreditation criterion based on interim standards and audit questionnaire with a focus on demonstrated independence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option provides separation from flag State interests, reducing the risk of bias or perceived conflicts of interest.
<i>Simultaneous data provision to Flag State and Secretariat (5)</i>	
Independence and impartiality can be supported with a focus on the standardization of data structures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In this approach, EM data (e.g., event codes, species codes, and timestamps) are submitted using agreed, standardized codes rather than free text.